

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the arguments set forth fully below. In the Office Action mailed September 25, 2006, claims 1-25 have been rejected. In response, the Applicants have submitted the following remarks and amended claims 10, 14 and 22-25. Accordingly, claims 1-25 are still pending. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amended claims and the remarks below.

Information Disclosure Statement

Within the Office Action, it is stated that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 26, 2004 fails to comply with 35 CFR §1.97(c) because it lacks a statement as specified in 37 CFR §1.97(e). The Applicants respectfully submit that, because the Information Disclosure Statement was filed with the application on March 26, 2004, that the Information Disclosure Statement complies with 37 CFR §1.97(b). According to 37 CFR §1.97, Information Disclosure Statements that comply with subsection b, need not comply with subsection c, thus not requiring a fee, nor a statement under subsection e. For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Information Disclosure Statement be considered by the Examiner.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 23-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 because the limitation “computer readable signal” has insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. By the above amendments, the Applicants have amended claims 23-25 to change “computer readable signal”, to “computer readable medium”, such phrase having sufficient antecedent basis. For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 10, 14 and 22 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as the term “event” is used by the Applicant to mean “event is a data file”, while the accepted

meaning, according to the Examiner, is “an action or occurrence.” Within the Office Action it is stated that this term is indefinite because the specification does not clearly redefine the term. The Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection, and submit that the term “event” is defined in context in various places in the specification including pages 2-3, paragraph 8; page 3, paragraph 9; page 6, paragraph 18; page 7, paragraph 19; page 7, paragraph 20; and page 10, paragraph 27. Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the term “event” used to mean “event is a data file” is commonly known in the art.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 10-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101, because none of the claims are directed to statutory subject matter. Within the Office action it is stated that the independent claims deal with simply an abstract idea, and that a claim that recites a computer that solely calculates a mathematical formula or computer disk that solely stores a mathematical formula is not directed to the type of statutory subject matter eligible for patent protection. Within the Office Action it is also stated that the claims are not producing useful, concrete and tangible results. By the above amendments, the Applicants have amended claims 10, 14 and 22 to include statutory subject matter. For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 10-25 under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-7, 9, 14-19 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0249809 to Bianco et al. (hereinafter Bianco). The Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection.

Within the Office Action, it is stated that Bianco teaches the claimed electronic document manager including the electronic image file database for storing the electronic image files, and the electronic image file event generator for generating electronic image

file events related to the electronic image files and a task engine in communication with said electronic document management module for generating tasks related to the electronic image files based upon the contents of said electronic image file events. The Examiner cites the Bianco reference, Figures 2a and 2b, paragraphs 87 and 89.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Bianco indeed does not teach an electronic image file event generator for generating electronic image file events related to the electronic image files and a task engine in communication with said electronic document management module for generating tasks related to the electronic image files based on the contents of said electronic image file events. In fact, the Bianco reference, in the Examiner's cited paragraphs, teaches a pre-event set 20 and a post event set 22 of electronically displayable files. The pre-event set 20 contains health information for preparing and educating the patient for the medical event, and the post event set 22 contains health information for preparing and educating the patient for post event recovering, and one of the two sets 20, 22 includes a task file that instructs the patient to perform a predetermined task as discussed below (Bianco, page 5, paragraph 87).

In contrast to the teachings of Bianco, the system and method for generating tasks related to electronic image files of the present invention includes a single electronic document manager and a single task engine, wherein the electronic document manager receives electronic image files and communicates with the task engine, such that the task engine generates a set of tasks based on the electronic image files received by the electronic document manager. The present invention does not include or claim two separate sets of electronically displayable files for pre or post event viewing by a patient.

The independent claim 1 is directed to a system for generating one or more tasks related to one or more electronic image files comprising an electronic document manager including an electronic file database for storing the electronic image files and electronic image file event generator for generating electronic image file events related to the electronic image files, and a task engine in communication with the said electronic document management module for generating tasks related to the electronic image files

based on the contents of said electronic image file events. As described above, Bianco does not teach an electronic document manager in communication with a task engine for generating task related to the electronic image files based on the contents of said electronic image file events. For at least these reasons the independent claim one is allowable over the teachings of Bianco.

Claims 2-7 and 9 are dependent upon the independent claim 1. As discussed above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Bianco. Accordingly, claims 2-7 and 9 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

The independent claim 14 is directed to a system for generating one or more task related to one more electronic image files comprising an electronic document management module including an electronic image file database for receiving from a user and storing the electronic image files in an electronic image file event generator submodule for generating electronic image file events related to the electronic image files, and a task engine module in communication with said electronic document management module for generating tasks related to the electronic image files based on the contents of said electronic image file events, said task engine module including a task generation submodule including an event manager for receiving and storing said electronic image file events, a rule set manager including at least one predetermined set of rules provided by the user, each of said rules having at least one predetermined condition, and a task generation manager for comparing the electronic image file events to said at least one predetermined set of rules and outputting one or more tasks if the electronic image file events meets at least one predetermined condition to the user. As described above with respect to claim 1, Bianco does not teach an electronic document manager communicating with a task engine in order to output a set of tasks related to the electronic image files. For at least these reasons, the independent claim 14 is allowable over the teachings of Bianco.

Claims 15-19 and 21 are dependent upon the independent claim 14. As discussed above, the independent claim 14 is allowable over the teachings of Bianco. Accordingly, claims 15-19 and 21 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 8, 10-13, 20 and 22-25 have been rejected under 35. U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bianco in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0140044 Mok et al. (hereinafter Mok). The Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection.

Claim 8 is dependent upon the independent claim 1. As discussed above, the independent claim 1 is allowable over the teachings of Bianco. Accordingly, claim 8 is also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim. The Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is relying on the Bianco reference in the same fashion as it would relied upon above in the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection. The Applicant respectfully submits that Bianco does not teach creating one or more electronic image file events related to the electronic image files using an electronic document manager and a task engine. Furthermore, as stated in the Office Action, Bianco does to explicitly teach sorting or filtering electronic documents. Regardless of the teachings of Mok, the combination of Bianco and Mok cannot teach the elements of the independent claims 10 and 22 when combined. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims 10 and 14 are allowable over the teachings of Bianco, Mok and their combination.

Claims 11-13, 20 and 23-25 are dependent upon the independent claims 10 and 22. As discussed above, the independent claims 10 and 22 are allowable over the teachings of Bianco, Mok and their combination. Accordingly, claims 11-13, 20 and 23-25 are also allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are now in a condition for allowance, and allowance at an early date would be appreciated. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, they are encouraged to call the undersigned at

Application No. 10/810,214
Amendment Dated January 25, 2007
Reply to Office Action of September 25, 2007

414-271-7590 to discuss the same so that any outstanding issues can be expeditiously resolved.

Respectfully submitted,

ANDRUS, SCEALES, STARKE & SAWALL, LLP

By Christopher M. Scherer
Christopher M. Scherer
Reg. No. 50,655

Andrus, Sceales, Starke & Sawall, LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
Telephone: (414) 271-7590
Facsimile: (414) 271-5770